arXiv:math/0701345v1 [math.CA] 12 Jan 2007

Irrationality proof of certain Lambert series using little q-Jacobi polynomials

J. Coussement, C. Smet
Department of Mathematics, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven,
Celestijnenlaan 200 B, 3001 Leuven, Belgium
jonathan.coussement@wis.kuleuven.be, christophe.smet@wis.kuleuven.be

Abstract

We apply the Padé technique to find rational approximations to

$$h^{\pm}(q_1,q_2)=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{q_1^k}{1\pm q_2^k},\qquad 0<q_1,q_2<1,\quad q_1\in\mathbb{Q},\quad q_2=1/p_2,\quad p_2\in\mathbb{N}\setminus\{1\}.$$

A separate section is dedicated to the special case $q_i=q^{r_i}, r_i\in\mathbb{N}, q=1/p, p\in\mathbb{N}\setminus\{1\}$. In this construction we make use of little q-Jacobi polynomials. Our rational approximations are good enough to prove the irrationality of $h^{\pm}(q_1,q_2)$ and give an upper bound for the irrationality measure.

1 Introduction

In this paper we investigate quantities of the form

$$h^{\pm}(q_1,q_2):=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{q_1^k}{1\pm q_2^k},\qquad 0<q_1,q_2<1,\quad q_1\in\mathbb{Q},\quad q_2=1/p_2,\quad p_2\in\mathbb{N}\setminus\{1\}.\tag{1.1}$$

Since we will assume q_1,q_2 to be fixed, we will write $h^{\pm}=h^{\pm}(q_1,q_2)$. In the special case

$$q_i=q^{r_i},\qquad q=1/p,\quad p\in\mathbb{N}\setminus\{1\},\quad r_i\in\mathbb{N},\tag{1.2}$$

by writing $(1+q_2^k)^{-1}=\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}(-q_2^k)^j$ and changing the order of summation, we clearly have

$$\lim_{q\uparrow 1}(1-q)\,h^{+}=\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^j}{r_1+jr_2}=\frac{1}{r_2}\,\Psi(-1,1,\frac{r_1}{r_2})$$

where Ψ is the Lerch transcendent, which is a generalization of the Hurwitz zeta function and the polylogarithm function. Some particular cases are $h^{+}(q,q)=-\ln_q 2$ and $h^{+}(q,q^2)=\beta_q(1)$ which are q-extensions of $-\ln 2$ and $\beta(1)=\pi/4$, respectively. In the same manner h^{-} can be seen as a q-analogue of the (harmonic) series $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(r_1+kr_2)^{-1}$.

In 1948 Erdős proved that $h^{-}(q,q)=\zeta_q(1)$ is irrational when $q=1/2$, see [9]. Later, Peter Borwein [5, 6] showed that $\zeta_q(1)$ and $\ln_q 2$ are irrational whenever $q=1/p$ with p an integer greater than 1. Other irrationality proofs were found in, e.g., [1, 8, 13, 18, 16, 19, 20]. To the best of our knowledge, the sharpest upper bounds for the irrationality measure of $\zeta_q(1)$ and $\ln_q 2$ which are known in the literature until now, are 2.42343562 and 3.29727451 respectively [19, 20].

In [14] Matala-aho and Prévost also considered quantities of the form (1.1). However, not all the numbers we prove to be irrational are covered by their result. To prove this irrationality we use a well-known lemma, which expresses the fact that a rational number can be approximated to order 1 by rational numbers and to no higher order [11, Theorem 186].

Lemma 1.1 *Let x be a real number. Suppose there exist integers a_n, b_n $(n \in \mathbb{N})$ such that*

- *(i)* $b_n x - a_n \neq 0$ *for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$*;*
- *(ii)* $\lim_{n\to\infty} (b_n x - a_n) = 0$,

then x is irrational.

Proof. Suppose x is rational, so write $x = a/b$ with a, b coprime. Then $b_n a - a_n b$ is a nonzero integer sequence that tends to zero, which is a contradiction. □

In Section 2 we construct rational approximations to $h^{\pm}$. In particular, we extend the Padé approximation technique applied in [18] to prove the irrationality of $\zeta_q(1)$ and $\ln_q 2$ and use little q-Jacobi polynomials (which are a generalization of the q-Legendre polynomials). Section 3 then mainly consists of calculating the asymptotic behaviour of the 'error term'. Section 4 points out what improvements can be made in the special case (1.2). If we define

$$\eta^- := 1 + \frac{3}{\pi^2}, \qquad \eta^+ := 1 + \frac{4}{\pi^2}, \tag{1.3}$$

$$\gamma^-(r_2) := \frac{3}{\pi^2}\left[1 + 2\prod_{\substack{\varpi | r_2 \\ \varpi \text{ prime}}} \frac{\varpi^2}{\varpi^2 - 1} \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ (l,r_2)=1}}^{r_2} \frac{1}{l^2} - \frac{1}{r_2}\prod_{\substack{\varpi | r_2 \\ \varpi \text{ prime}}} \frac{\varpi}{\varpi + 1}\right] < 1 + \frac{3}{\pi^2} \tag{1.4}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma^+(r_2) := \frac{1}{\pi^2}&\left[4 + 6\prod_{\substack{\varpi | r_2 \\ \varpi \text{ prime}}} \frac{\varpi^2}{\varpi^2 - 1} \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ (l,r_2)=1}}^{r_2} \frac{1}{l^2}\right] \\ &- \frac{1-(-1)^{r_2}}{2\pi^2}\left[\frac{2}{r_2}\prod_{\substack{\varpi | r_2 \\ \varpi \text{ prime}}} \frac{\varpi}{\varpi + 1} + \prod_{\substack{\varpi | r_2 \\ \varpi \text{ prime}}} \frac{\varpi^2}{\varpi^2 - 1} \sum_{\substack{l=\lceil \frac{r_2}{2} \rceil \\ (l,r_2)=1}}^{r_2} \frac{1}{l^2}\right] < 1 + \frac{4}{\pi^2},\end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

then our main results are the following.

Theorem 1.2 *Let $q_2 = 1/p_2$ with $p_2 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$ and $q_1 \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $0 < q_1 < 1$. Then the number $h^{\pm}$, defined as in (1.1), is irrational. Moreover, there exist integer sequences $a_n^{\pm}$, $b_n^{\pm}$ such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left|b_n^{\pm} h^{\pm} - a_n^{\pm}\right|^{1/n^2} \leq p_2^{\eta^{\pm} - \frac{3}{2}} < 1 \tag{1.6}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} |b_n^{\pm}|^{1/n^2} \leq p_2^{\eta^{\pm} + \frac{3}{2}}. \tag{1.7}$$

Theorem 1.3 *Let $q = 1/p$ with $p \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$, $q_i = q^{r_i}$ and $p_i = p^{r_i}$ with $r_i \in \mathbb{N}$, $i = 1, 2$ and $(r_1, r_2) = 1$. Then the number $h^{\pm}$, defined as in (1.1), is irrational. Moreover, there exist integer sequences $a_n^{\pm}$, $b_n^{\pm}$ such that*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left|b_n^{\pm} h^{\pm} - a_n^{\pm}\right|^{1/n^2} \leq p_2^{\gamma^{\pm}(r_2) - \frac{3}{2}} < 1 \tag{1.8}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} |b_n^{\pm}|^{1/n^2} \leq p_2^{\gamma^{\pm}(r_2) + \frac{3}{2}}. \tag{1.9}$$

r_2	$m^-(r_2)$	$m^+(r_2)$
1	$\frac{2\pi^2}{\pi^2-4} \approx 3.362953864$	$\frac{6\pi^2}{3\pi^2-14} \approx 3.793858357$
2	$\frac{6\pi^2}{3\pi^2-20} \approx 6.162845000$	$\frac{2\pi^2}{\pi^2-8} \approx 10.55796017$
3	$\frac{16\pi^2}{8\pi^2-57} \approx 7.192005083$	$\frac{96\pi^2}{48\pi^2-373} \approx 9.405127174$
4	$\frac{54\pi^2}{27\pi^2-205} \approx 8.668909282$	$\frac{54\pi^2}{27\pi^2-232} \approx 15.45734242$
5	$\frac{1728\pi^2}{864\pi^2-6565} \approx 8.690997496$	$\frac{10368\pi^2}{5184\pi^2-42797} \approx 12.22991528$
6	$\frac{300\pi^2}{150\pi^2-1211} \approx 10.98899223$	$\frac{150\pi^2}{75\pi^2-668} \approx 20.49894619$
7	$\frac{86400\pi^2}{43200\pi^2-338681} \approx 9.724867074$	$\frac{103680\pi^2}{51840\pi^2-440701} \approx 14.42473632$
8	$\frac{132300\pi^2}{66150\pi^2-534587} \approx 11.03878708$	$\frac{66150\pi^2}{33075\pi^2-294856} \approx 20.67290169$
9	$\frac{940800\pi^2}{470400\pi^2-3801647} \approx 11.04061736$	$\frac{1128960\pi^2}{564480\pi^2-4937467} \approx 17.58230823$
10	$\frac{71442\pi^2}{35721\pi^2-294473} \approx 12.14040518$	$\frac{71442\pi^2}{35721\pi^2-322256} \approx 23.27373406$

Table 1: Some values of the upper bound $m^{\pm}(r_2)$ for the irrationality measure of $h^{\pm}$.

Remark 1.4 In fact, Theorem 1.3 can also be applied if $\gcd(r_1, r_2) = \rho \neq 1$. In that case just note that $h^{\pm}(q_1, q_2) = h^{\pm}(q'^{r'_1}, q'^{r'_2})$ with $r'_1 = r_1/\rho$, $r'_2 = r_2/\rho$ and $q' = q^{\rho}$.

As a side result of the irrationality, we also obtain an upper bound for the irrationality measure (Liouville-Roth number, order of approximation) for $h^{\pm}$. Recall that this measure is defined as

$$\mu(x) := \inf \left\{ t \;:\; \left| x - \frac{a}{b} \right| > \frac{1}{b^{t+\varepsilon}},\ \forall \varepsilon > 0,\ \forall a, b \in \mathbb{Z},\ b \,\text{sufficiently large} \right\},$$

see, e.g., [7]. It is known that all rational numbers have irrationality measure 1, whereas irrational numbers have irrationality measure at least 2. Furthermore, if $b_n x - a_n \neq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $|b_n x - a_n| = \mathcal{O}(b_n^{-s})$ with $0 < s < 1$ and $|b_n| < |b_{n+1}| < |b_n|^{1+o(1)}$, then the measure of irrationality satisfies $2 \leq \mu(x) \leq 1 + 1/s$, see [7, exercise 3, p. 376]. Note that by (1.6) and (1.7), respectively (1.8) and (1.9), we get the asymptotic behaviour

$$\left| b_n^{\pm} h^{\pm} - a_n^{\pm} \right| = \mathcal{O}\Big((b_n^{\pm})^{-\frac{3-2\,\eta^{\pm}}{3+2\,\eta^{\pm}} + \varepsilon} \Big), \qquad \text{for all } \varepsilon > 0, \qquad n \to \infty, \tag{1.10}$$

and for the special case (1.2)

$$\left| b_n^{\pm} h^{\pm} - a_n^{\pm} \right| = \mathcal{O}\Big((b_n^{\pm})^{-\frac{3-2\,\gamma^{\pm}(r_2)}{3+2\,\gamma^{\pm}(r_2)} + \varepsilon} \Big), \qquad \text{for all } \varepsilon > 0, \qquad n \to \infty, \tag{1.11}$$

which then implies the following upper bound for $\mu(h^{\pm})$.

Corollary 1.5 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1.2 we have $2 \leq \mu(h^{\pm}) \leq \nu^{\pm}$; under the assumptions of Theorem 1.3 we have $2 \leq \mu(h^{\pm}) \leq m^{\pm}(r_2)$ where*

$$m^{\pm}(r_2) = \left(\frac{3 - 2\,\gamma^{\pm}(r_2)}{6} \right)^{-1}, \tag{1.12}$$

with $m^{\pm}(r_2) \leq \nu^{\pm}$, where $\nu^{+} = \frac{6\pi^2}{\pi^2-8}$ and $\nu^{-} = \frac{6\pi^2}{\pi^2-6}$.

Remark 1.6 In the case (1.2) with $r_2 = 1$, we can sharpen the upper bound $m^{\pm}(r_2)$. We will discuss this in Section 5. In particular, we will show that $\mu(\zeta_q(1)) \leq \frac{2\pi^2}{\pi^2-2} \approx 2.508284762$, which was also found in [18], and $\mu(\ln_q 2) \leq \frac{6\pi^2}{3\pi^2-8} \approx 2.740438628$, which is a better upper bound than the one in [19].

2 Rational approximation

We first focus on the general case (1.1), the special case (1.2) will be treated in Section 4. We use the notation $q_1 = s_1/t_1$ with $\gcd(s_1, t_1) = 1$, and $p_1 = 1/q_1$.

2.1 Padé approximation

To prove the irrationality of $h^{\pm}$ we will apply Lemma 1.1. So we need a sequence of 'good' rational approximations. To find these we will perform the (well-known) idea of Padé approximation to the Markov function

$$f(z) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{q_1^k}{z - q_2^k} = \int_0^1 \frac{q_1^{\log_{q_2} x}}{z - x} \frac{\mathrm{d}_{q_2} x}{x}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\log_q x = \frac{\log x}{\log q}$ and the q-integration is defined as

$$\int_0^1 g(x)\, \mathrm{d}_q x := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q^k g(q^k). \tag{2.2}$$

So, we look for polynomials P_n and Q_n of degree n such that

$$Q_n(z) f(z) - P_n(z) = O\left(z^{-n-1}\right), \qquad z \to \infty. \tag{2.3}$$

As is well known in the Padé approximation theory (see, e.g., [15]) the polynomials Q_n then satisfy the orthogonality relations

$$\int_0^1 Q_n(x)\, x^m\, q_1^{\log_{q_2} x}\, x^{-1}\, \mathrm{d}_{q_2} x = 0, \qquad m = 0, \ldots, n-1. \tag{2.4}$$

Little q-Jacobi polynomials satisfy

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p_n(q^k; a, b|q) p_m(q^k; a, b|q) (aq)^k \frac{(bq;q)_k}{(q;q)_k} = 0, \qquad m \neq n. \tag{2.5}$$

Hence Q_n are little q-Jacobi polynomials with a particular set of parameters, namely $Q_n(z) = p_n(z; q_1 p_2, 1|q_2)$, see, e.g., [12, Section 3.12].

Lemma 2.1 *The polynomials Q_n have the explicit expressions*

$$\begin{aligned} Q_n(z) &= \sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{(p_2^n; q_2)_k (q_1 q_2^n; q_2)_k}{(q_1; q_2)_k (q_2; q_2)_k}\, q_2^k\, z^k, & (2.6)\\ &= \frac{(p_2^n; q_2)_n}{(q_1; q_2)_n} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{(p_2^n; q_2)_k (q_1 q_2^n; q_2)_k}{[(q_2; q_2)_k]^2}\, q_2^k\, (q_2 z; q_2)_k. & (2.7) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From, e.g., [12, Section 3.12], we know that the polynomials satisfying the orthogonality conditions (2.4) have the hypergeometric expression

$$Q_n(z) = {}_2\phi_1 \left(\begin{matrix} p_2^n, q_1 q_2^n \\ q_1 \end{matrix} \middle| q_2; q_2 z \right),$$

which is (2.6). Next we apply the transformation formula [12, (0.6.24)] and find

$$Q_n(z) = \frac{(p_2^n; q_2)_n}{(q_1; q_2)_n}\, {}_3\phi_2 \left(\begin{matrix} p_2^n, q_1 q_2^n, q_2 z \\ q_2, 0 \end{matrix} \middle| q_2; q_2 \right),$$

giving the expression (2.7). □

It is easily checked that the P_n are connected with the polynomials Q_n by the formula

$$P_n(z) = \int_0^1 \frac{Q_n(z) - Q_n(x)}{z - x}\, q_1^{\log_{q_2} x}\, x^{-1}\, \mathrm{d}_{q_2} x. \tag{2.8}$$

Indeed, then

$$Q_n(z) f(z) - P_n(z) = \int_0^1 \frac{Q_n(x)}{z - x}\, q_1^{\log_{q_2} x}\, x^{-1}\, \mathrm{d}_{q_2} x, \tag{2.9}$$

and the conditions (2.3) are fulfilled.

Lemma 2.2 *The polynomials P_n have the explicit formulae*

$$\begin{aligned} P_n(z) &= \sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{(p_2^n;q_2)_k (q_1 q_2^n;q_2)_k}{(q_1;q_2)_k (q_2;q_2)_k}\, q_2^k \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{z^j}{1 - q_1 q_2^{k-j-1}}, & (2.10)\\ &= -\frac{(p_2^n;q_2)_n}{(q_1;q_2)_n} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{(p_2^n;q_2)_k (q_1 q_2^n;q_2)_k}{[(q_2;q_2)_k]^2}\, q_2^k \\ &\qquad\qquad \times \sum_{j=1}^{k} q_2^j\, (q_2^{j+1} z;q_2)_{k-j}\, \frac{(q_2;q_2)_{j-1}}{(q_1;q_2)_j}. & (2.11) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. First of all we mention that (for $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$)

$$\int_0^1 \frac{z^k - x^k}{z - x}\, q_1^{\log_{q_2} x}\, x^{-1}\, \mathrm{d}_{q_2} x = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} z^j \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} q_2^{(k-1-j)\ell} q_1^\ell = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{z^j}{1 - q_1 q_2^{k-j-1}}.$$

So, applying (2.6) to (2.8) we easily obtain (2.10). Next, observe that

$$\frac{(q_2 z;q_2)_k - (q_2 x;q_2)_k}{z - x} = -\sum_{j=1}^{k} q_2^j\, (q_2^{j+1} z;q_2)_{k-j}\, (q_2 x;q_2)_{j-1} \tag{2.12}$$

which one can prove by induction. Moreover, using the q-binomial series [2, Section 10.2], [10, Section 1.3]

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a;q)_n}{(q;q)_n} x^n = \frac{(ax;q)_\infty}{(x;q)_\infty}, \qquad |q| < 1,\ |x| < 1,$$

we get

$$\int_0^1 (q_2 x;q_2)_{j-1}\, q_1^{\log_{q_2} x}\, x^{-1}\, \mathrm{d}_{q_2} x = (q_2;q_2)_{j-1} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{(q_2^j;q_2)_\ell}{(q_2;q_2)_\ell}\, q_1^\ell = \frac{(q_2;q_2)_{j-1}}{(q_1;q_2)_j}. \tag{2.13}$$

Combining (2.8), (2.7), (2.12) and (2.13) we then finally establish (2.11). □

2.2 Rational approximants to $h^\pm$

Notice that by the definition (2.1) of f we have

$$h^\pm = \mp \frac{q_1}{q_2}\, f(\mp p_2).$$

Following the idea of Padé approximation we could try to approximate $h^{\pm}$ by the sequence of rational numbers $\mp q_1 P_n(\mp p_2)/[q_2 Q_n(\mp p_2)]$. However, we prefer the evaluation of f at $\mp p_2^n$, which gives

$$h^{\pm} = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{q_1^k}{1 \pm q_2^k} \mp \left(\frac{q_1}{q_2}\right)^n f(\mp p_2^n). \tag{2.14}$$

In this way we can benefit from the fact that the finite sum on the right hand side of (2.14) already gives a good approximation for $h^{\pm}$. Moreover, the approximation (2.3) is useful for z tending to infinity. Hence the evaluation at the point $\mp p_2^n$ makes more sense, especially since n itself will tend to infinity too. So, a 'natural' choice for rational approximations $a_n^{\pm}/b_n^{\pm}$ to $h^{\pm}$ then has the following expressions.

Definition 2.3 Define

$$a_n^{\pm} := e_n^{\pm} \left[p_1^n \, Q_n(\mp p_2^n) \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{q_1^k}{1 \pm q_2^k} \mp p_2^n \, P_n(\mp p_2^n) \right], \tag{2.15}$$

$$b_n^{\pm} := e_n^{\pm} \; p_1^n \, Q_n(\mp p_2^n), \tag{2.16}$$

where $e_n^{\pm}$ are factors such that these are integer sequences.

The following lemma gives a possible choice for the factors $e_n^{\pm}$.

Lemma 2.4 *By taking*

$$e_n^{\pm} = \left(\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (t_1 p_2^k - s_1) \right)^2 s_1^n \operatorname{lcm} \left\{ p_2^k \pm 1 \,\middle|\, 0 \le k \le n-1 \right\} \tag{2.17}$$

the $a_n^{\pm}$ and $b_n^{\pm}$, defined as in (2.15) and (2.16), are integer sequences.

Proof. It is not very convenient to prove that an expression is an integer when it depends on the rational q_2. So, we first write $Q_n(\mp p_2^n)$ depending on the integer p_2. By (2.6) we get

$$Q_n(\mp p_2^n) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{(p_2^n; q_2)_k (p_1 p_2^n; p_2)_k}{(p_1; p_2)_k (p_2; p_2)_k} \, p_2^{\frac{k^2-k}{2}} (\pm 1)^k. \tag{2.18}$$

Notice that

$$\frac{(p_2^n; q_2)_k}{(p_2, p_2)_k} = \frac{(p_2; p_2)_n}{(p_2; p_2)_{n-k} (p_2; p_2)_k} = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}_{p_2},$$

which is an integer. Moreover, the possible denominators t_1 appear as often in the numerator as in the denominator of $Q_n(\mp p_2^n)$. The factor s_1^n in $e_n^{\pm}$ is needed because of the factor p_1^n in $a_n^{\pm}$ and $b_n^{\pm}$. So the only denominators in $Q_n(\mp p_2^n)$ originate from $(p_1; p_2)_k$, and hence they are cancelled out by the first product in $e_n^{\pm}$. This already implies that $b_n^{\pm}$ is an integer. Obviously, then also

$$e_n^{\pm} \, p_1^n \, Q_n(\mp p_2^n) \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{q_1^k}{1 \pm q_2^k} = b_n^{\pm} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{q_1^k}{1 \pm q_2^k}$$

is an integer by the definition of $e_n^{\pm}$. So, what remains to prove is that $e_n^{\pm} \, p_2^n \, P_n(\mp p_2^n)$ is an integer. By (2.10) we have

$$P_n(\mp p_2^n) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{(p_2^n; q_2)_k (p_1 p_2^n; p_2)_k}{(p_1; p_2)_k (p_2; p_2)_k} (-1)^k \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{(\mp 1)^j \, p_1 p_2^{\frac{k^2+k}{2} + n(j-k) - j - 1}}{p_1 p_2^{k-j-1} - 1}. \tag{2.19}$$

Since $(p_2;p_2)_k$ is a divisor of $(p_2^n;q_2)_k$, it is clear that by (4.1) the only possible denominators in $e_n^\pm\, p_2^n\, P_n(\mp p_2^n)$ are powers of p_2. The formula (2.11) leads to

$$P_n(\mp p_2^n) = \frac{(p_2^n;q_2)_n}{(p_1;p_2)_n} \sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{(p_2^n;q_2)_k (p_1 p_2^n;p_2)_k}{\left[(p_2;p_2)_k\right]^2}\, p_1^{n-k} p_2^{\binom{n-k}{2}}\, (-1)^{n-k}$$

$$\times \sum_{j=1}^{k} \left(\frac{p_1}{p_2}\right)^j\, (\mp p_2^{n-j-1};q_2)_{k-j}\, \frac{(p_2;p_2)_{j-1}}{(p_1;p_2)_j}.$$

□

Remark 2.5 Looking at (2.19) one could expect a power of p_2 in the denominator of $p_2^n\, P_n(\mp p_2^n)$, and this of the order of $p_2^{n^2/2}$. This would totally ruin the asymptotics in the next section. However, Maple calculations showed the absence of a power of p_2 in the denominator. This is why we had to use an equivalent formula for P_n, which is given by (2.11).

3 Irrationality of $h^\pm$

In this section we look at the error term $b_n^\pm h^\pm - a_n^\pm$, where $a_n^\pm$ and $b_n^\pm$ are defined as in Definition 2.3 and (2.17). Using (2.14) and (2.9) one easily sees that it has the integral representation

$$\begin{aligned} b_n^\pm h^\pm - a_n^\pm &= \mp e_n^\pm\, p_2^n \Big[Q_n(\mp p_2^n) f(\mp p_2^n) - P_n(\mp p_2^n)\Big] \\ &= e_n^\pm\, p_2^n \int_0^1 \frac{Q_n(x)}{p_2^n \pm x}\, q_1^{\log_{q_2} x}\, x^{-1}\, \mathrm{d}_{q_2} x. \qquad (3.1) \end{aligned}$$

We will show that this expression is different from zero for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and obtain its asymptotic behaviour. Here we study

$$R_n^\pm := \int_0^1 \frac{Q_n(x)}{p_2^n \pm x}\, q_1^{\log_{q_2} x}\, x^{-1}\, \mathrm{d}_{q_2} x \qquad (3.2)$$

and $e_n^\pm$ separately.

3.1 Asymptotic behaviour of $R_n^\pm$

We will need the following very general lemma for sequences of polynomials with uniformly bounded zeros. This can be found in, e.g., [18, Lemma 3], but we include a short proof for completeness.

Lemma 3.1 *Let $\{\pi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of monic polynomials for which deg$(\pi_n) = n$ and the zeros $x_{j,n}$ satisfy $|x_{j,n}| \le M$, with M independent of n. Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} |\pi_n(cx^n)|^{1/n^2} = |x|, \qquad |x| > 1,\ c \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Proof. Since $|x| > 1$, for large n we easily get

$$0 \le |cx^n| - M \le |cx^n - x_{j,n}| \le |cx^n| + M, \qquad j = 1,\ldots,n.$$

This implies

$$(|cx^n| - M)^n \le |\pi_n(cx^n)| \le (|cx^n| + M)^n$$

and

$$|x| \left(|c| - \frac{M}{|x|^n}\right)^{1/n} \le |\pi_n(cx^n)|^{1/n^2} \le |x| \left(|c| + \frac{M}{|x|^n}\right)^{1/n}.$$

The lemma then follows by taking limits. □

For $R_n^\pm$, defined as in (3.2), we have the following asymptotic result. Here we use a similar reasoning as in [18] for the irrationality of $\zeta_q(1)$.

Lemma 3.2 *Let Q_n be the polynomials (2.6) satisfying the orthogonality relations (2.4). Then $R_n^\pm$ is different from zero for all n and*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left|R_n^\pm\right|^{1/n^2} = p_2^{-3/2}. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. First of all observe that

$$Q_n(\mp p_2^n)\, R_n^\pm = \mp \int_0^1 Q_n(x)\, \frac{Q_n(\mp p_2^n) - Q_n(x)}{\mp p_2^n - x}\, q_1^{\log_{q_2} x}\, x^{-1}\, \mathrm{d}_{q_2}x + \int_0^1 \frac{Q_n^2(x)}{p_2^n \pm x}\, q_1^{\log_{q_2} x}\, x^{-1}\, \mathrm{d}_{q_2}x.$$

The first integral on the right hand side vanishes because of the orthogonality relations (2.4) for the polynomial Q_n. Furthermore, note that $0 \le x \le 1$ so that

$$0 < \frac{1}{p_2^n + 1} \int_0^1 Q_n^2(x)\, q_1^{\log_{q_2} x}\, x^{-1}\, \mathrm{d}_{q_2}x \le Q_n(\mp p_2^n)\, R_n^\pm \le \frac{1}{p_2^n - 1} \int_0^1 Q_n^2(x)\, q_1^{\log_{q_2} x}\, x^{-1}\, \mathrm{d}_{q_2}x. \tag{3.4}$$

This already proves that $R_n^\pm \neq 0$. Next, from [12, (3.12.2)] we get

$$\int_0^1 Q_n^2(x)\, q_1^{\log_{q_2} x}\, x^{-1}\, \mathrm{d}_{q_2}x = \frac{q_1^n}{1 - q_1 q_2^{2n}} \left(\frac{(q_2;q_2)_n}{(q_1;q_2)_n}\right)^2.$$

Applying this on (3.4), we easily establish

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left|Q_n(\mp p_2^n)\, R_n^\pm\right|^{1/n^2} = 1. \tag{3.5}$$

Now write $Q_n(x) = \kappa_n\, \hat{Q}_n(x)$ where $\hat{Q}_n$ is monic. From (2.6) we get that the leading coefficient κ_n has the expression

$$\kappa_n = \frac{(p_2^n;q_2)_n (q_1 q_2^n;q_2)_n}{(q_1;q_2)_n (q_2;q_2)_n}\, q_2^n.$$

Since $\prod_{i=1}^n p_2^{i-1} \le |(p_2^n;q_2)_n| \le \prod_{i=1}^n p_2^i$, this gives the asymptotic behaviour

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} |\kappa_n|^{1/n^2} = p_2^{1/2}. \tag{3.6}$$

Since the Q_n are orthogonal polynomials with respect to a positive measure on $[0,1]$, their zeros are all in $[0,1]$. From Lemma 3.1 we then also get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left|\hat{Q}_n\left(\mp p_2^n\right)\right|^{1/n^2} = p_2. \tag{3.7}$$

Applying (3.6) and (3.7) to (3.5) then completes the proof. $\square$

3.2 Asymptotic behaviour of $e_n^\pm$

We obviously have the asymptotic properties

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (t_1 p_2^k - s_1)\right)^{1/n^2} = p_2^{1/2}, \tag{3.8}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} (s_1^n)^{1/n^2} = 1, \tag{3.9}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\mathrm{lcm}\left\{ p_2^k - 1 \,\middle|\, 0 \le k \le n-1 \right\}\right)^{1/n^2} \le p_2^{3/\pi^2}, \tag{3.10}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\mathrm{lcm}\left\{ p_2^k + 1 \,\middle|\, 0 \le k \le n-1 \right\}\right)^{1/n^2} \le p_2^{4/\pi^2}, \tag{3.11}$$

where the latter two are well-known properties of the least common multiple that can easily be deduced from the asymptotic results as given in (4.4). This leads us to the following asymptotic behaviour of $e_n^{\pm}$.

Corollary 3.3 *For $e_n^{\pm}$ defined as in (2.17) we have*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left|e_n^{\pm}\right|^{1/n^2} \leq p_2^{\eta^{\pm}}, \tag{3.12}$$

where $\eta^{\pm}$ is defined as in (1.3). As a result we now have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left|b_n^{\pm} h^{\pm} - a_n^{\pm}\right|^{1/n^2} \leq p_2^{\eta^{\pm}-\frac{3}{2}}. \tag{3.13}$$

3.3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

In the previous sections we defined integer sequences $a_n^{\pm}$ and $b_n^{\pm}$ and managed to find the asymptotic behaviour of $b_n^{\pm} h^{\pm} - a_n^{\pm}$. Putting these results together, we can now prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. In Lemma 2.4 we made sure that $a_n^{\pm}$ and $b_n^{\pm}$, defined as in (2.15) and (2.16), are integer sequences. Note that by (3.6), (3.7) and (3.12) we then get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} |b_n|^{1/n^2} \leq p_2^{\eta^{\pm}+\frac{3}{2}}. \tag{3.14}$$

Lemma 3.2 assures us that $b_n^{\pm} h^{\pm} - a_n^{\pm} \neq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and since $\eta^{\pm} < \frac{3}{2}$, (3.13) guarantees that $\lim_{n\to\infty} |b_n^{\pm} h^{\pm} - a_n^{\pm}| = 0$. So, all the conditions of Lemma 1.1 are fulfilled and $h^{\pm}$ is irrational. $\square$

4 Improvements on the results in the special case (1.2)

Throughout this section we consider the special case given by (1.2). The only difference with the general case is that we can (in some cases considerably) improve the factor $e_n^{\pm}$, which is needed to make the approximation sequences into integer sequences. The following lemma gives the enhanced formula for $e_n^{\pm}$, and can be seen as an analogue of Lemma 2.17.

Lemma 4.1 *By taking*

$$\begin{aligned} e_n^{\pm} = \operatorname{lcm}\left\{ \operatorname{denom}\left((p_1 p_2^n; p_2)_k \, (p_1; p_2)_k^{-1}\right) \,\middle|\, 0 \leq k \leq n-1 \right\} & \\ \times \operatorname{lcm}\left\{ p_2^j \pm 1,\, p_1 p_2^k - 1 \,\middle|\, 1 \leq j \leq n-1,\, 0 \leq k \leq n-1 \right\} & \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

the $a_n^{\pm}$ and $b_n^{\pm}$, defined as in (2.15) and (2.16), are integer sequences.

Proof. The proof is completely analogous to the proof of Lemma 2.4. There is no factor s_1^n needed since in this case p_1 is an integer. $\square$

4.1 Asymptotic behaviour of $e_n^{\pm}$

In order to obtain some asymptotic results for the quantities $e_n^{\pm}$, see (4.1), we will use the cyclotomic polynomials

$$\Phi_n(x) = \prod_{\substack{k=1,\\(k,n)=1}}^{n} \left(x - e^{\frac{2\pi i k}{n}}\right). \tag{4.2}$$

Their degree is denoted by Euler's totient function $\phi(n)$, being the number of positive integers $\leq n$ that are coprime with n. It is well-known [17, Section 4.8] that

$$x^n - 1 = \prod_{d|n} \Phi_d(x), \qquad n = \sum_{d|n} \phi(d), \tag{4.3}$$

and that every cyclotomic polynomial is monic, has integer coefficients and is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}[x]$. Furthermore, some interesting asymtotic properties are

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \phi(aj) = \frac{3a}{\pi^2} \prod_{\substack{\varpi|a \\ \varpi \text{ prime}}} \frac{\varpi}{\varpi+1}, \tag{4.4}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \phi(aj+b) = \frac{3a}{\pi^2} \prod_{\substack{\varpi|a \\ \varpi \text{ prime}}} \frac{\varpi^2}{\varpi^2-1}, \tag{4.5}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \phi(2(aj+b)) = \frac{4a}{\pi^2} \prod_{\substack{\varpi|a,\, \varpi\geq 3 \\ \varpi \text{ prime}}} \frac{\varpi^2}{\varpi^2-1}, \tag{4.6}$$

where $(a,b)=1$, see [3, 4, 14]. They imply the following results.

Lemma 4.2 *Let* $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $(r_1, r_2) = 1$. *Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left[\operatorname{lcm} \left\{ p_2^j - 1,\, p_1 p_2^k - 1 \,\middle|\, 1 \leq j \leq n-1,\, 0 \leq k \leq n-1 \right\} \right]^{1/n^2} \leq p_2^{\theta^-(r_2)}, \tag{4.7}$$

where

$$\theta^-(r_2) = \gamma^-(r_2) - \frac{3}{\pi^2} \prod_{\substack{\varpi|r_2 \\ \varpi \text{ prime}}} \frac{\varpi^2}{\varpi^2-1} \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ (l,r_2)=1}}^{r_2} \frac{1}{l^2}$$

with $0 < \theta^-(r_2) < \frac{3}{\pi^2} + \frac{1}{2}$ *and* $\gamma^-(r_2)$ *defined as in (1.4).*

Proof. By (4.3) and Lemma A.1 in the appendix we have that

$$M_n^- := \prod_{d=1}^{n-1} \Phi_d(p_2) = \prod_{\substack{d|r_2k \text{ for} \\ \text{some } 1\leq k\leq n-1}} \Phi_d(p) \tag{4.8}$$

is a common multiple of all $p_2^j - 1$, $j = 1, \ldots, n-1$. Next, for each $1 \leq l \leq r_2 - 1$, $(l, r_2) = 1$ we define $1 \leq b_l \leq r_2 - 1$ by $b_l \equiv r_1/l \bmod r_2$. Notice that if $d \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfies $dl = r_2 k + r_1$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $d \equiv b_l \bmod r_2$ and $(l, r_2) = 1$ since $(r_1, r_2) = 1$. Hence

$$\mathcal{M}_n := \prod_{\substack{d|r_2k+r_1 \text{ for} \\ \text{some } 0\leq k\leq n-1}} \Phi_d(p) = \prod_{\substack{l=1 \\ (l,r_2)=1}}^{r_2} \prod_{j=0}^{\left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{l} - \frac{lb_l - r_1}{lr_2} \right\rfloor} \Phi_{jr_2+b_l}(p) \tag{4.9}$$

is a common multiple of all $p_1 p_2^k - 1$, $k = 0, \ldots, n-1$. So, $M_n^- \, \mathcal{M}_n$ is a multiple of e_n^-. However, there are some factors of the form $\Phi_{jr_2+b_l}(p)$ appearing in both $\mathcal{M}_n$ and M_n^-. Looking at (4.8), since $(r_2, b_l) = 1$ this means that $jr_2 + b_l$ should be a divisor of a natural number $k \leq n-1$.

So, if n is large enough the factor $\Phi_{jr_2+b_l}(p)$ of $\mathcal{M}_n$ is also present in M_n^- for j from 0 up to $\lfloor\frac{n-1}{r_2}\rfloor - 1$ ($\leq \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{l} - \frac{lb_l - r_1}{lr_2} \right\rfloor$), meaning that they have the common factor

$$C_n^- := \prod_{\substack{l=1 \\ (l,r_2)=1}}^{r_2} \prod_{j=0}^{\lfloor\frac{n-1}{r_2}\rfloor - 1} \Phi_{jr_2+b_l}(p). \tag{4.10}$$

We proved that $M_n^- \, \mathcal{M}_n \, / \, C_n^-$ is a multiple of e_n^-. Now we look at its asymptotic behaviour. Applying (4.4) on (4.8) we easily establish

$$\log_{p_2}\left[\lim_{n\to\infty} \left(M_n^-\right)^{1/n^2}\right] = \frac{3}{\pi^2}. \tag{4.11}$$

Next, recall that $(r_2, b_l) = 1$. So, by (4.5) we also get

$$\log_{p_2}\left[\lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\mathcal{M}_n\right)^{1/n^2}\right] = \frac{3}{\pi^2} \prod_{\substack{\varpi | r_2 \\ \varpi \text{ prime}}} \frac{\varpi^2}{\varpi^2 - 1} \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ (l,r_2)=1}}^{r_2} \frac{1}{l^2} < \frac{1}{2}, \tag{4.12}$$

$$\log_{p_2}\left[\lim_{n\to\infty} \left(C_n^-\right)^{1/n^2}\right] = \frac{3}{\pi^2} \frac{\phi(r_2)}{r_2^2} \prod_{\substack{\varpi | r_2 \\ \varpi \text{ prime}}} \frac{\varpi^2}{\varpi^2 - 1} = \frac{3}{\pi^2} \frac{1}{r_2} \prod_{\substack{\varpi | r_2 \\ \varpi \text{ prime}}} \frac{\varpi}{\varpi + 1}, \tag{4.13}$$

where the last equality follows from the well-known fact

$$\frac{\phi(m)}{m} = \prod_{\substack{\varpi | m \\ \varpi \text{ prime}}} \frac{\varpi - 1}{\varpi}. \tag{4.14}$$

Combining (4.11), (4.12) and (4.13) we then finally obtain (4.7). $\square$

Remark 4.3 The common multiple $\mathcal{M}_n$ of all $p_1 p_2^k - 1$, $k = 0, \ldots, n-1$ and its asymptotic behaviour were discussed already in [14, Lemma 2].

Lemma 4.4 *Let* $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $(r_1, r_2) = 1$. *Then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left[\operatorname{lcm}\left\{ p_2^j + 1,\, p_1 p_2^k - 1 \,\middle|\, 1 \leq j \leq n-1,\, 0 \leq k \leq n-1 \right\}\right]^{1/n^2} \leq p_2^{\theta^+(r_2)}, \tag{4.15}$$

where

$$\theta^+(r_2) = \gamma^+(r_2) - \frac{3}{\pi^2} \prod_{\substack{\varpi | r_2 \\ \varpi \text{ prime}}} \frac{\varpi^2}{\varpi^2 - 1} \sum_{\substack{l=1 \\ (l,r_2)=1}}^{r_2} \frac{1}{l^2}$$

with $0 < \theta^+(r_2) < \frac{4}{\pi^2} + \frac{1}{2}$ *and* $\gamma^+(r_2)$ *defined as in (1.5).*

Proof. Recall from the proof of Lemma 4.2 that $\mathcal{M}_n$, defined as in (4.9), is a common multiple of all $p_1 p_2^k - 1$, $k = 0, \ldots, n-1$. By the property $x^j + 1 = (x^{2j} - 1)/(x^j - 1)$, (4.3) and Lemma A.2 in the appendix we also have that

$$M_n^+ := \prod_{d=1}^{n-1} \Phi_{2d}(p_2) = \prod_{\substack{d | 2r_2 k,\, d \nmid r_2 k \text{ for} \\ \text{some } 1 \leq k \leq n-1}} \Phi_d(p) \tag{4.16}$$

is a common multiple of all $p_2^j + 1$, $j = 1, \ldots, n-1$. So, $M_n^+ \, \mathcal{M}_n$ is a multiple of e_n^+.

If r_2 is even, then the index $jr_2 + b_l$ is odd since $(r_2, b_l) = 1$. So, in this case there are no factors of the form $\Phi_{jr_2+b_l}(p)$ appearing in both $\mathcal{M}_n$ and M_n^+. Now suppose that r_2 is odd. Then

$$M_n^+ = \prod_{\substack{d | r_2 k \text{ for} \\ \text{some } 1 \leq k \leq n-1}} \Phi_{2d}(p).$$

This implies that for a factor $\Phi_{jr_2+b_l}(p)$ of $\mathcal{M}_n$ also appearing in M_n^+, we should have $j \equiv b_l \mod 2$ and $\frac{jr_2+b_l}{2}$ should be a divisor of a natural number $k \leq n-1$. So, in the case that r_2 is odd, $\mathcal{M}_n$ and M_n^+ have the common factor

$$C_n^+ := \prod_{\substack{l=1 \\ (l,r_2)=1}}^{r_2} \prod_{\substack{j=0 \\ j \equiv b_l \bmod 2}}^{\min\left(\lfloor \frac{2(n-1)}{r_2} \rfloor - 1, \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{l} - \frac{lb_l - r_1}{lr_2} \right\rfloor\right)} \Phi_{jr_2+b_l}(p). \tag{4.17}$$

and $M_n^+ \, \mathcal{M}_n \, / \, C_n^+$ is a multiple of e_n^+.

Now we are interested in the asymptotic behaviour of M_n^+ and C_n^+. Applying (4.4) on (4.16) we easily obtain

$$\log_{p_2} \left[\lim_{n \to \infty} \left(M_n^+ \right)^{1/n^2} \right] = \frac{4}{\pi^2} < \frac{1}{2}. \tag{4.18}$$

Next, we suppose r_2 is odd and look at (4.17). Note that for n large enough we have $\lfloor \frac{2(n-1)}{r_2} \rfloor - 1 > \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{l} - \frac{lb_l - r_1}{lr_2} \right\rfloor$ if and only if $l > \frac{r_2}{2}$. Moreover, if b_l is even, then $j = 2i$ is even and we write $jr_2 + b_l = 2(ir_2 + b_l/2)$. On the other hand, if b_l is odd then $j = 2i + 1$ is odd and we write $jr_2 + b_l = 2(ir_2 + (b_l + r_2)/2)$. By (4.6) and (4.14) we then get

$$\begin{aligned} \log_{p_2} \left[\lim_{n \to \infty} \left(C_n^+ \right)^{1/n^2} \right] &= \frac{\phi(r_2)}{2r_2^2} \frac{4}{\pi^2} \prod_{\substack{\varpi | r_2 \\ \varpi \text{ prime}}} \frac{\varpi^2}{\varpi^2 - 1} + \frac{1}{\pi^2} \prod_{\substack{\varpi | r_2 \\ \varpi \text{ prime}}} \frac{\varpi^2}{\varpi^2 - 1} \sum_{\substack{l = \lceil \frac{r_2}{2} \rceil \\ (l, r_2) = 1}}^{r_2} \frac{1}{l^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{r_2} \frac{2}{\pi^2} \prod_{\substack{\varpi | r_2 \\ \varpi \text{ prime}}} \frac{\varpi}{\varpi + 1} + \frac{1}{\pi^2} \prod_{\substack{\varpi | r_2 \\ \varpi \text{ prime}}} \frac{\varpi^2}{\varpi^2 - 1} \sum_{\substack{l = \lceil \frac{r_2}{2} \rceil \\ (l, r_2) = 1}}^{r_2} \frac{1}{l^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

Combining (4.18), (4.12) and (4.19) we then finally obtain (4.15). □

By (4.3) we obtain

$$\frac{(p_1 p_2^n; p_2)_k}{(p_1; p_2)_k} = \frac{\prod_{i=n}^{n+k-1} \prod_{d | r_2 i + r_1} \Phi_d(p)}{\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \prod_{d | r_2 i + r_1} \Phi_d(p)}.$$

Having a closer look at this expression, it is clear that its denominator is a divisor of $\mathcal{M}_n$, defined as in (4.9), for each $0 \leq k \leq n-1$. As a corollary of Lemma 4.2, Lemma 4.4 and (4.12) we then get the following asymptotic behaviour for $e_n^{\pm}$.

Corollary 4.5 *Let $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(r_1, r_2) = 1$. For $e_n^{\pm}$ defined as in (4.1) we have*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \left| e_n^{\pm} \right|^{1/n^2} \leq p_2^{\gamma^{\pm}(r_2)}, \tag{4.20}$$

where $\gamma^-(r_2)$ and $\gamma^+(r_2)$ are defined as in (1.4) and (1.5). As a result we now have

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \left| b_n^{\pm} h^{\pm} - a_n^{\pm} \right|^{1/n^2} \leq p_2^{\gamma^{\pm}(r_2) - \frac{3}{2}}. \tag{4.21}$$

4.2 Proof of Theorem 1.3

In the previous sections we defined integer sequences $a_n^\pm$ and $b_n^\pm$ and managed to find the asymptotic behaviour of $b_n^\pm h^\pm - a_n^\pm$. Putting these results together, we can now prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. In Lemma 4.1 we made sure that $a_n^\pm$ and $b_n^\pm$, defined as in (2.15) and (2.16), are integer sequences. Note that by (3.6), (3.7) and (4.20) we then get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} |b_n|^{1/n^2} \le p_2^{\gamma^\pm(r_2)+\frac{3}{2}}. \tag{4.22}$$

Lemma 3.2 assures us that $b_n^\pm h^\pm - a_n^\pm \neq 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and since $\gamma^\pm < \frac{3}{2}$, (4.21) guarantees that $\lim_{n\to\infty} |b_n^\pm h^\pm - a_n^\pm| = 0$. So, all the conditions of Lemma 1.1 are fulfilled and $h^\pm$ is irrational. Obviously, the irrationality also follows from the result in the general case, as given in Theorem 1.2. The sharper asymptotics for this case were only necessary to find the upper bounds for the irrationality measure, as proposed in Corollary 1.5. □

5 Final remark on the special case (1.2)

In Lemma 4.1 we proposed a possible factor $\mathrm{e}_n^\pm$ such that $a_n^\pm$ and $b_n^\pm$, defined as in (2.15) and (2.16), are integers. It seems that this choice is (asymptotically) not the optimal one. Empirically (using Maple) we observed that $e_n^\pm$ can be replaced by

$$\xi_n^- = \frac{(p_1;p_2)_n}{(p_2;p_2)_{n-1}} \operatorname{lcm}\left\{ p_2^j - 1,\, p_1 p_2^k - 1 \,\middle|\, 1 \le j \le n-1,\, 0 \le k \le n-1 \right\}, \tag{5.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_n^+ = \frac{(p_1;p_2)_n}{(p_2;p_2)_n} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{p_2^{m_i}-1}{p^{m_i}-1} \prod_{\substack{d\mid r_2,\, d\neq 2\\ d \text{ prime}}} \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \Big(\phi_{d^k}(p)\Big)^{\left\lfloor \frac{n}{d^k} \right\rfloor} \\ \times \operatorname{lcm}\left\{ p_2^j + 1,\, p_1 p_2^k - 1 \,\middle|\, 1 \le j \le n-1,\, 0 \le k \le n-1 \right\},\end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

where m_i is the highest odd factor of i and $\lfloor x \rfloor$ is the integer part of x. Then the $a_n^\pm$ and $b_n^\pm$ are still integers and $\gcd(a_n^\pm, b_n^\pm)$ turns out to be very small and asymptotically irrelevant. Up to now we do not have an exact proof for this, except for the case $r_2 = 1$. Having in mind the proof of Lemma 4.1, in this case the denominator of

$$\frac{(p_1 p^n;p)_k}{(p_1;p)_k} = \begin{bmatrix} n+k+r_1-1 \\ n \end{bmatrix}_p \begin{bmatrix} n+r_1-1 \\ n \end{bmatrix}_p^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} n+k+r_1-1 \\ n \end{bmatrix}_p \frac{(p;p)_n}{(p_1;p)_n}$$

is clearly cancelled out by the first factor of (5.1) and (5.2).

Now define $\delta^-(r_2) := \theta^-(r_2)$ and $\delta^+(r_2) := \theta^+(r_2) + \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{3r_2}$, where $\theta^\pm(r_2)$ is as in Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.4. Following the arguments of this paper, with the adjustment mentioned above we could prove the existence of integer sequences $\alpha_n^\pm$, $\beta_n^\pm$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n\to\infty} \left|\xi_n^\pm\right|^{1/n^2} \le p_2^{\delta^\pm(r_2)}, \\ &\left|\beta_n^\pm h^\pm - \alpha_n^\pm\right| = \mathcal{O}\Big(\left(\beta_n^\pm\right)^{-\frac{3-2\,\delta^\pm(r_2)}{3+2\,\delta^\pm(r_2)}+\varepsilon} \Big), \qquad \text{for all } \varepsilon > 0, \qquad n \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

implying

$$\mu\left(h^\pm\right) \le \chi^\pm(r_2) := \left(\frac{3 - 2\,\delta^\pm(r_2)}{6} \right)^{-1}. \tag{5.3}$$

Comparing Table 1 with Table 2 we see that this would considerably improve the upper bound for the irrationality measure.

r_2	$\chi^-(r_2)$	$\chi^+(r_2)$
1	$\frac{2\pi^2}{\pi^2-2} \approx 2.508284762$	$\frac{6\pi^2}{3\pi^2-8} \approx 2.740438628$
2	$\frac{2\pi^2}{\pi^2-4} \approx 3.362953864$	$\frac{9\pi^2}{4\pi^2-24} \approx 5.738728718$
3	$\frac{32\pi^2}{16\pi^2-69} \approx 3.552067296$	$\frac{432\pi^2}{184\pi^2-1071} \approx 5.722990389$
4	$\frac{54\pi^2}{27\pi^2-125} \approx 3.767042717$	$\frac{108\pi^2}{45\pi^2-304} \approx 7.606512209$
5	$\frac{3456\pi^2}{1728\pi^2-8005} \approx 3.769124031$	$\frac{25920\pi^2}{10656\pi^2-68555} \approx 6.986661787$
6	$\frac{300\pi^2}{150\pi^2-743} \approx 4.015077389$	$\frac{675\pi^2}{275\pi^2-1953} \approx 8.752624192$
7	$\frac{172800\pi^2}{86400\pi^2-414281} \approx 3.889740382$	$\frac{1814400\pi^2}{734400\pi^2-4949917} \approx 7.791520131$
8	$\frac{132300\pi^2}{66150\pi^2-327931} \approx 4.018388861$	$\frac{264600\pi^2}{106575\pi^2-766112} \approx 9.139383255$
9	$\frac{1881600\pi^2}{940800\pi^2-4664047} \approx 4.018510114$	$\frac{25401600\pi^2}{10192000\pi^2-71413173} \approx 8.592266790$
10	$\frac{71442\pi^2}{35721\pi^2-180973} \approx 4.109498873$	$\frac{178605\pi^2}{71442\pi^2-521890} \approx 9.621306357$

Table 2: Some values of $\chi^{\pm}(r_2)$, see (5.3).

Acknowledgements

We like to thank W. Van Assche for careful reading and useful discussions.

This work was supported by INTAS project 03-51-6637, by FWO projects G.0184.02 and G.0455.05 and by OT/04/21 of K.U.Leuven. The first author is a postdoctoral researcher at the K.U.Leuven (Belgium).

Appendix

In this appendix we prove some properties dealing with the cyclotomic polynomials (4.2). In the proofs we use the notation $a|_c b$ which means that $a|b$ and that a contains any prime factor present in both b and c, up to the highest possible power.

Lemma A.1 *The cyclotomic polynomials satisfy*

$$\prod_{d=1}^{n-1} \Phi_d(x^r) = \prod_{\substack{d|rk \text{ for} \\ \text{some } 1\leq k\leq n-1}} \Phi_d(x), \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{A.1}$$

Proof. Both expressions in (A.1) are a common multiple of the polynomials $\{x^{rj}-1, j = 1, \ldots, n-1\}$, the latter one being the least common multiple. Since they are both monic polynomials, it is sufficient to prove that their respective degrees are equal. Recall that Euler's totient function ϕ represents the degree of the cyclotomic polynomials. So, we have to prove the equality

$$r\sum_{d=1}^{n-1} \phi(d) = \sum_{\substack{d|rk \ \text{for} \\ \text{some } 1\leq k\leq n-1}} \phi(d).$$

It is easily seen that this holds for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ if and only if

$$r\phi(n) = \sum_{d|_n r} \phi(nd), \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{A.2}$$

Denote by g the smallest divisor of r such that r/g contains no prime factors present in n. Next, recall some well-known properties of the totient function, such as

$$\phi(ab) = \phi(a)\phi(b) \qquad \text{if } (a,b) = 1; \tag{A.3}$$

$$\phi(ab) = a\phi(b) \qquad \text{if } a \text{ prime and } a|b. \tag{A.4}$$

Using these and (4.3) we obtain

$$\sum_{d|_n r} \phi(nd) = \sum_{d|\frac{r}{g}} \phi(ndg) = \phi(ng) \sum_{d|\frac{r}{g}} \phi(d) = \phi(ng)\frac{r}{g} = r\phi(n),$$

which is (A.2). This then proves the statement of the lemma. □

Lemma A.2 *For any prime number σ we have*

$$\prod_{d=1}^{n-1} \Phi_{\sigma d}(x^r) = \prod_{\substack{d|\sigma rk,\, d\nmid rk \text{ for} \\ \text{some } 1\le k\le n-1}} \Phi_d(x), \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{A.5}$$

Proof. First of all note that both expressions are a common multiple of the set of polynomials

$$\left\{ \frac{x^{\sigma r j} - 1}{x^{rj} - 1}, j = 1, \ldots, n-1 \right\},$$

the latter one being the least common multiple. As in the proof of the previous lemma, since they are both monic polynomials, it is sufficient to prove that they have the same degree. Hence we have to prove the equality

$$r \sum_{d=1}^{n-1} \phi(\sigma d) = \sum_{\substack{d|\sigma rk,\, d\nmid rk \text{ for} \\ \text{some } 1\le k\le n-1}} \phi(d).$$

Introduce the notation $r = \sigma^\tau r'$ where r' does not contain the prime factor σ. This then holds for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ if and only if

$$r\phi(\sigma n) = \sum_{d|_n r'} \phi(\sigma^{\tau+1} nd), \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{A.6}$$

From this point, we can proceed in an analogous way as in the previous lemma. Denote by g the smallest divisor of r' such that r'/g contains no prime factors present in n. By (A.3) we then get

$$\sum_{d|_n r'} \phi(\sigma^{\tau+1} nd) = \sum_{d|\frac{r'}{g}} \phi(\sigma^{\tau+1} ngd) = \phi(\sigma^{\tau+1} ng) \sum_{d|\frac{r'}{g}} \phi(d).$$

Next, applying (4.3) and (A.4) we finally obtain

$$\sum_{d|_n r'} \phi(\sigma^{\tau+1} nd) = \phi(\sigma^{\tau+1} ng)\frac{r'}{g} = \phi(\sigma^{\tau+1} n) r' = \phi(\sigma n) r.$$

This ends the proof of (A.6) and hence of this lemma. □

References

[1] T. Amdeberhan and D. Zeilberger, q-Apéry irrationality proofs by q-WZ pairs, *Adv. Appl. Math.* **20** (1998), 275–283.

[2] G.E. Andrews, R. Askey and R. Roy, *Special Functions*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications **71**, Cambridge University Press, 1999.

[3] E. Bavencoffe, PPCM de suites de polynomes, *Ann. Fac. SC. Toulouse* **1** (1992), 147–168.

[4] J.-P. Bézivin, Plus petit commun multiple des termes consécutifs d'une suite récurrente linéaire, *Collect. Math.* **40** (1989), no.1, 1–11.

[5] P. Borwein, On the irrationality of $\sum \frac{1}{q^n+r}$, *J. Number Theory* **37** (1991), 253–259.

[6] P. Borwein, On the irrationality of certain series, *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **112** (1992), 141–146.

[7] J.M. Borwein and P. Borwein, *Pi and the AGM - A study in Analytic Number Theory and Computational Complexity*, Wiley, New York, 1995.

[8] P. Bundschuh and K. Väänänen, Arithmetical investigations of a certain infinite product, *Compositio Math. 91* (1994), 175–199.

[9] P. Erdős, On arithmetical properties of Lambert series, *J. Indiana Math. Soc.* **12** (1948), 63–66.

[10] G. Gasper and M. Rahman, *Basic Hypergeometric Series*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications **35**, Cambridge University Press, 1990.

[11] G.H. Hardy and E.M. Wright, *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers*, Oxford University Press, 1938 (5th edition, 1979).

[12] R. Koekoek and R. Swarttouw, *The Askey-scheme of hypergeometric orthogonal polynomials and its q-analogue*, Reports of the faculty of Technical Mathematics and Informatics no. 98-17, Technische Universiteit Delft, 1998, math.CA/9602214 at arXiv.org.

[13] T. Matala-aho and K. Väänänen, On approximation measures of q-logarithms, *Bull. Australian Math. Soc.* **58** (1998), 15–31.

[14] T. Matala-aho and M. Prévost, Quantitative irrationality for sums of reciprocals of Fibonacci and Lucas numbers, *The Ramanujan Journal* **11** (2006), 249–261.

[15] E.M. Nikishin and V.N. Sorokin, *Rational Approximations and Orthogonality*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI **92**, 1991.

[16] K. Postelmans and W. Van Assche, Irrationality of $\zeta_q(1)$ and $\zeta_q(2)$, submitted to *J. Number Theory*, math.CA/0604312 at arXiv.org.

[17] J. Stillwell, *Elements of Algebra*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.

[18] W. Van Assche, Little q-Legendre polynomials and irrationality of certain Lambert series, *The Ramanujan Journal* **5** (2001), 295–310.

[19] W. Zudilin, Remarks on irrationality of q-harmonic series, *Manuscripta Math.* **107** (2002), 463–477.

[20] W. Zudilin, Diophantine problems for q-zeta values, *Mat. Zametki* **72** (2002), no. 6, 936–940 (in Russian); translation in *Math. Notes* **72** (2002), no. 5-6, 858–862.